



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/089,681	05/22/2002	Kalevi Ratschunas	042933/321091	2735
826	7590	05/16/2007	EXAMINER	
ALSTON & BIRD LLP			HASHEM, LISA	
BANK OF AMERICA PLAZA			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
101 SOUTH TRYON STREET, SUITE 4000			2614	
CHARLOTTE, NC 28280-4000			MAIL DATE	
			05/16/2007	
			DELIVERY MODE	
			PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/089,681	RATSCHUNAS ET AL.	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 February 2007.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-5,8-12,14-17,20-23,35 and 37-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-5,8-12,14-17,20-23,35 and 37-41 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____.

FINAL DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 2-15-07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Brown does not teach '...transmitting a delivery report to the originator of the message only when the originator of the message is allowed to receive the delivery report...' and '...a possibility can be set which allows or prohibits a caller to receive delivery reports...'. Further, Applicant argues regarding Brown that '...delivery of such reports is not conditioned on a status of the originator as being allowed to receive the report, but instead based on whether or not the originator has asked to receive such report...'. Examiner disagrees. The limitations: '...a possibility can be set which allows or prohibits a caller to receive delivery reports...' and '...delivery of such reports is not conditioned on a status of the originator as being allowed to receive the report ...' are not recited in claim 1. Brown teaches that an originator must enter a billing code in order to retrieve a delivery report. If the billing code is valid, then the originator is allowed to receive a delivery report or choose to listen to a delivery report (col. 9, line 61 – col. 10, line 18). Therefore, the originator is allowed to receive the delivery report only when the billing code or credit card number is valid. Brown clearly teaches the claimed limitations.

2. Applicant argues that Mukherjee fails to disclose '...that the user restrictions can be such that some originators are excluded from sending the messages...', '...the list of originators allowed to receive delivery reports...', '...restricting sending of the delivery reports to avoid revealing the location of the user...', and transmitting delivery reports to originators allowed to receive the delivery reports as determined by a judging unit...'. Examiner disagrees. The

limitations: ‘...that the user restrictions can be such that some originators are excluded from sending the messages...’ and ‘...restricting sending of the delivery reports to avoid revealing the location of the user...’ are not recited in claims 12 and 35. Mukherjee clearly discloses determining whether a delivery report is to be transmitted in response to an originator sending a message, wherein a user restriction level is determined based on the access level of the originator’s usergroup that is listed in a database or multipoint usergroup database (Fig. 1, 26) (col. 3, lines 34-45; col. 4, lines 7-58; col. 6, lines 21-30). If the originator is part of a usergroup that has authorization to transmit a message to a subscriber, then the originator is allowed to receive a successful delivery report based on authorization to transmit a message to a destination or terminal device and successful transmission to the destination. The judging unit is included in the service center (col. 3, lines 15-26; col. 6, lines 21-30). Mukherjee clearly discloses the claimed limitations.

3. Claim 21 was listed twice in the claims filed on 2-15-2007. Examiner assumes one of the claims numbered as 21 refers to claim 22.

Claim Objections

4. Claim 35 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 35 recites the limitation "said judging means". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1-5, 8, 9, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 4,972,461 by Brown et al, hereinafter Brown.

Regarding claim 1, Brown discloses a method comprising: delivering messages in a network (Fig. 1) comprising at least one terminal device (Fig. 1: 163), wherein delivering messages comprises:

generating a message;

setting a condition for receiving said message (col. 8, lines 5-31);

deciding whether said message is to be received by a terminal device on the basis of said condition;

transmitting said message to said terminal device on the basis of a result of the deciding whether the message is to be received (col. 12, line 38 – col. 14, line 44),

deciding whether an originator of said message is allowed to receive a delivery report (col. 9, line 20 – col. 10, line 18; col. 13, lines 28-44; e.g. valid billing code is entered to receive delivery report or notification call is requested for status of delivery),

and transmitting said delivery report to the originator of said message only in case said originator of said message is allowed, (col. 9, line 61 – col. 10, line 18; col. 13, lines 28-44);

wherein a list of originators of messages which are allowed to receive delivery reports is stored in a database (Fig. 1, 123; e.g. service unit (SU)) (e.g. inherently the system must have a record of originators that are allowed to receive delivery reports since the system services multiple subscribers that can call into the system and send a message and receive delivery status on that message, the system must distinguish between the different originators and delivery reports) (col. 6, lines 66-68; col. 8, lines 53-59; col. 9, line 61 – col. 10, line 18; col. 13, lines 28-44).

Regarding claim 2, the method according to claim 1, wherein Brown further discloses the condition is set by a terminal device (col. 8, lines 5-31).

Regarding claim 3, the method according to claim 1, wherein Brown further discloses said condition is a location of said terminal device (col. 13, lines 48-55; col. 14, lines 45-53).

Regarding claim 4, the method according to claim 1, wherein Brown further discloses including information regarding said condition in an optional field of said message (col. 11, lines 18-45; col. 12, lines 20-29).

Regarding claim 5, the method according to claim 1, wherein Brown further discloses determining whether said terminal device is inactive or busy when said condition is not met (col. 12, lines 38-51).

Regarding claim 8, the method according to claim 1, wherein Brown further discloses defining a group of users (e.g. originators with valid billing codes) which are allowed to receive delivery reports, wherein in said deciding whether said message is to be received it is detected whether the originator of said received message is a member of said group of users (col. 8, lines 53-59; col. 9, line 61 – col. 10, line 18; col. 11, lines 3-14).

Regarding claim 9, the method according to claim 8, wherein Brown further discloses adding a group identifier identifying said group of users to said message (col. 11, lines 18-45).

Regarding claim 10, the method of claim 1, wherein Brown further discloses said message is a multimedia message (col. 15, lines 62-63).

7. Claims 12, 14, 20, 21, 23, 35, 37, 39, 40, and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,289,223 by Mukherjee et al, hereinafter Mukherjee.

Regarding claim 12, Mukherjee discloses a network system configured to deliver messages in a network (Fig. 1), comprising:

a message delivering device; and a terminal device (e.g. a service center; Fig. 1, 18; Fig. 4, 170); wherein said message delivering device comprises a deciding unit configured to decide whether a message is to be received by said terminal device on the basis of a condition (e.g. if the originator is allowed to send a SMS message to a receiving subscriber or receiving group of subscribers) for receiving said message (col. 4, lines 7-37; col. 6, lines 21-30), and a transmitting unit configured to transmit said message to said terminal device on the basis of a deciding result of said deciding unit to said terminal device (col. 6, lines 21-30), wherein said terminal device further comprises (e.g. a service center; Fig. 1, 18; Fig. 4, 170)

a judging unit configured to determine whether a delivery report is to be transmitted or not in response to receiving said message (col. 3, lines 15-26; col. 4, lines 17-37; col. 6, lines 13-30; e.g. delivering a report to an authorized originator when said message is sent to a recipient);

a transmitting unit configured to transmit said delivery report in case said judging means judges that said delivery report is to be transmitted (col. 6, lines 21-30), and

a database (e.g. multipoint usergroup database; Fig. 2, 26) in which a list of originators of message is stored (e.g. specified originator list) (Fig. 2) which are allowed to receive delivery reports and which is accessed by said judging means (col. 4, lines 7-58; col. 5, lines 6-21; col. 5, line 66 – col. 6, line 30).

Regarding claim 14, the system of claim 12, wherein Mukherjee further discloses a setting unit configured to set a condition for receiving a message by said terminal device (col. 3, line 34 – col. 4, line 58).

Regarding claim 20, the system of claim 12, wherein Mukherjee further discloses a group of users (e.g. specified originator list) permitted to receive delivery reports, and said judging unit configured to detect whether an originator of said received message is a member of said group of users is determined (col. 3, line 46 – col. 4, line 37; col. 6, lines 13-30).

Regarding claim 21, the system of claim 20, wherein Mukherjee further discloses a group identifier identifying said group of users is added to said message (Fig. 2; col. 3, line 46 – col. 4, line 37; col. 6, lines 13-30).

Regarding claim 23, the system of claim 12, wherein Mukherjee further discloses said network is a mobile network (Fig. 1) and said terminal device is a mobile terminal device (Fig. 1, 12) (col. 3, lines 3-33).

Regarding claim 35, Mukherjee discloses a terminal device (e.g. a service center; Fig. 1, 18; Fig. 4, 170) configured to receive a message for which a condition (col. 3, lines 15-21; col. 4, lines 7-44) for receiving said message is set for use in network (Fig. 1; Fig. 4), comprising: a receiving unit configured to receive said message (col. 4, lines 59-66; col. 5, lines 37-43);

a judging unit configured to judge whether a delivery report is to be transmitted or not in response to receiving said message (e.g. delivering a report to an authorized originator when said message is sent to a recipient); and

a transmitting unit configured to transmit said delivery report in case said judging means judges that said delivery report is to be transmitted (col. 6, lines 21-30);

a database (e.g. multipoint usergroup database; Fig. 2, 26) in which a list of originators is stored (Fig. 2, 26), which are allowed to receive delivery reports, and which is accessed by said judging means (col. 4, lines 7-58; col. 5, lines 6-21; col. 5, line 66 – col. 6, line 30).

Regarding claim 37, the terminal device of claim 35, wherein Mukherjee further discloses said condition is a location of said terminal device (col. 3, lines 15-21; col. 4, lines 7-44).

Regarding claim 39, the terminal device of claim 35, wherein Mukherjee further discloses said network is a mobile network (Fig. 1; Fig. 4) and said terminal device is a mobile terminal device (e.g. device connected to a mobile network) (Fig. 1, 18; Fig. 4, 170) (col. 3, lines 3-33; col. 5, lines 37-65; col. 6, lines 21-30).

Regarding claim 40, Mukherjee discloses a network system configured to deliver messages in a network (Fig. 1), comprising:

a message delivering device; and a terminal device (e.g. a service center; Fig. 1, 18; Fig. 4, 170); wherein said message delivering device comprises for deciding whether a message is to be received by said terminal device on the basis of a condition (e.g. if the originator is allowed to send a SMS message to a receiving subscriber or receiving group of subscribers) for receiving said message (col. 4, lines 7-37; col. 6, lines 21-30), and means for transmitting said message on the basis of a deciding result of said means for deciding said terminal device (col. 6, lines 21-30),

wherein said terminal device further comprises (e.g. a service center; Fig. 1, 18; Fig. 4, 170) a means for judging whether a delivery report is to be transmitted or not in response to receiving said message (col. 4, lines 17-37; col. 6, lines 13-30; e.g. delivering a report to an authorized originator when said message is sent to a recipient); means for transmitting said delivery report in case said means for judging judges that said delivery report is to be transmitted (col. 6, lines 21-30), and means for storing (e.g. multipoint usergroup database; Fig. 2, 26) a list of originators of messages (e.g. specified originator list) (Fig. 2), which are allowed to receive delivery reports and which is accessed by said means for judging (col. 4, lines 7-58; col. 5, lines 6-21; col. 5, line 66 – col. 6, line 30).

Regarding claim 41, Mukherjee discloses a terminal device (e.g. a service center; Fig. 1, 18; Fig. 4, 170) for receiving a message for which a condition (col. 3, lines 15-21; col. 4, lines 7-44) for receiving said message is set for use in network (Fig. 1; Fig. 4), comprising means for receiving said message (col. 4, lines 59-66; col. 5, lines 37-43); means for judging whether a delivery report is to be transmitted or not in response to receiving said message (e.g. delivering a report to an authorized originator when said message is sent to a recipient); and means for transmitting said delivery report in case said judging means judges that said delivery report is to be transmitted (col. 3, lines 15-26; col. 6, lines 21-30), and means for storing (e.g. multipoint usergroup database; Fig. 2, 26) a list of originators of messages (Fig. 2, 26), which are allowed to receive delivery reports and which is accessed by said judging means (col. 4, lines 7-58; col. 5, lines 6-21; col. 5, line 66 – col. 6, line 30).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown, as applied to claim 1, in further view of Mukherjee.

Regarding claim 11, the method according to claim 1, wherein Brown does not disclose said network is a mobile network and said terminal device is a mobile terminal device.

Mukherjee discloses a method for delivering messages in a network (Fig. 1) comprising at least one terminal device (Fig. 1: 12), comprising (see Abstract; col. 3, line 3 – col. 4, line 37): generating a message (col. 2, lines 5-21; col. 4, lines 7-9 and lines 62-66); setting a condition for receiving said message (e.g. if the originator is allowed to send a SMS message to a receiving subscriber or receiving group of subscribers) (col. 4, lines 7-37); deciding whether said message is to be received by a terminal device based on said condition (col. 6, lines 21-30); transmitting said message to said terminal device based on deciding whether the message is to be received (col. 6, lines 21-30); deciding whether the originator of said message is allowed to send said message (col. 4, lines 17-37; col. 6, lines 13-30); and transmitting a delivery report to the originator of said message only when said originator of said message is allowed to receive the delivery report (e.g. authorized to send a SMS message);

wherein a list of originators of messages (e.g. specified originator list) (Fig. 2) which are allowed to receive delivery reports is stored in a database (e.g. multipoint usergroup database; Fig. 2, 26) (col. 4, lines 7-58; col. 5, lines 6-21; col. 5, line 66 – col. 6, line 30).

Wherein Mukherjee further discloses said network is a mobile network (Fig. 1) and said terminal device is a mobile terminal device (Fig. 1, 12) (col. 3, lines 3-33).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Brown to include said network is a mobile network and said terminal device is a mobile terminal device as taught by Mukherjee. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been lead to make such a modification to include sending a message from a standard telephone system to a recipient with a mobile terminal device in a mobile network, wherein the caller can enter a message recipient's mobile terminal number as the destination of the message.

10. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mukherjee, as applied to claim 12, in further view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,119,014 by Alperovich et al, hereinafter Alperovich.

Regarding claim 15, the system of claim 12, wherein Mukherjee does not disclose said condition is a location of said terminal device.

Alperovich discloses a system for delivering messages in a network (Figs. 1-4) comprising at least one terminal device (Fig. 4: 400, 480), comprising: generating a message (e.g. SMS message; Fig. 4, 420) (col. 5, lines 27-30); setting a condition (e.g. priority indication, location information) for receiving said message (col. 4, lines 7-12; col. 5, lines 27-35);

deciding whether said message is to be received by a terminal device based on said condition (e.g. if terminal device is in location area corresponding to the location information then send the message);

transmitting said message to said terminal device (Fig. 4, 400) based on deciding whether the message is to be received (e.g. whether the terminal device is in the location area) (col. 5, line 50 – col. 6, line 3);

the originator of said message is allowed to receive a delivery report (e.g. deciding whether the message was delivered); and

transmitting said delivery report to the originator of said message (col. 2, line 20 – col. 3, line 11).

Wherein Alperovich further discloses said condition is a location of said terminal device (col. 5, line 27 – col. 6, line 3).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Mukherjee to include said condition is a location of said terminal device as taught by Alperovich. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been lead to make such a modification to include a condition, such as location, that can be set for delivering a message to a terminal in order to reduce load on the network since no messages are transmitted which are not required and the delivering of the message is dependent on whether the terminal is in a particular area to send, for example, advertisements or information regarding a specific area.

11. Claims 16, 17, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mukherjee, as applied to claim 12, in further view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,966,663 by Gleason.

Regarding claim 16, the system of claim 12, wherein Mukherjee said message comprises an optional field in which information regarding said condition is included.

Gleason discloses a system for delivering messages in a network comprising at least one terminal device (e.g. cellular telephone; Fig. 1, 16) (see Abstract; col. 6, lines 13-28), comprising:

generating a message;

setting a condition for receiving said message (col. 10, lines 46-55; col. 12, lines 2-7; col. 24, line 66 – col. 25, line 2);

deciding whether said message is to be received by a terminal device (Fig. 1, 16) based on said condition (col. 10, lines 58-65);

transmitting said message to said terminal device based on deciding whether the message is to be received (col. 8, line 49 – col. 9, line 6; col. 10, lines 58-65; col. 12, lines 46-57);

deciding whether the originator of said message is allowed to receive a delivery report (col. 25, lines 16-26); and

transmitting said delivery report to the originator of said message only when said originator of said message is allowed to receive the delivery report (col. 12, lines 57-61; col. 20, lines 44-53; col. 25, lines 16-26).

Wherein Gleason further discloses said message comprises an optional field in which information regarding said condition is included (col. 20, lines 55-67; col. 24, line 56 - col. 29, line 31).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Mukherjee to include information regarding said condition in

an optional field of said message as taught by Gleason. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been lead to make such a modification in order for the optional field that includes the condition to be easily detected within the message.

Regarding claim 17, the system according to claim 12, wherein Mukherjee does not disclose wherein said message delivering device further comprises a determining means configured to determine whether said terminal device is not reachable when said deciding means decides that said condition is unmet.

Gleason discloses a system for delivering messages in a network comprising at least one terminal device (e.g. cellular telephone; Fig. 1, 16) (see Abstract; col. 6, lines 13-28), comprising:

generating a message;

setting a condition for receiving said message (col. 10, lines 46-55; col. 12, lines 2-7; col. 24, line 66 – col. 25, line 2);

deciding whether said message is to be received by a terminal device (Fig. 1, 16) based on said condition (col. 10, lines 58-65);

transmitting said message to said terminal device based on deciding whether the message is to be received (col. 8, line 49 – col. 9, line 6; col. 10, lines 58-65; col. 12, lines 46-57);

deciding whether the originator of said message is allowed to receive a delivery report (col. 25, lines 16-26); and

transmitting said delivery report to the originator of said message only when said originator of said message is allowed to receive the delivery report (col. 12, lines 57-61; col. 20, lines 44-53; col. 25, lines 16-26).

Wherein Gleason further comprises a determining unit configured to determine whether said terminal device is not reachable when said deciding means decides that said condition is unmet (col. 6, lines 16-28; col. 12, lines 54-57; col. 24, line 66 – col. 25, line 2).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Mukherjee to include determining whether said terminal device is inactive or busy when said condition is not met as taught by Gleason. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been lead to make such a modification in order to handle delivering messages in the same way as if the terminal is not available at the moment, wherein the method can omit a special procedure for handling messages which do not meet the condition and it can be decided whether delivering of the message should be retried later or whether the message should not be delivered at all.

Regarding claim 22, the system of claim 12, wherein Mukherjee does not disclose said message is a multimedia message.

Gleason discloses a system for delivering messages in a network comprising at least one terminal device (e.g. cellular telephone; Fig. 1, 16) (see Abstract; col. 6, lines 13-28), comprising:

generating a message;

setting a condition for receiving said message (col. 10, lines 46-55; col. 12, lines 2-7; col. 24, line 66 – col. 25, line 2);

deciding whether said message is to be received by a terminal device (Fig. 1, 16) based on said condition (col. 10, lines 58-65);

transmitting said message to said terminal device based on deciding whether the message is to be received (col. 8, line 49 – col. 9, line 6; col. 10, lines 58-65; col. 12, lines 46-57); deciding whether the originator of said message is allowed to receive a delivery report (col. 25, lines 16-26); and

transmitting said delivery report to the originator of said message only when said originator of said message is allowed to receive the delivery report (col. 12, lines 57-61; col. 20, lines 44-53; col. 25, lines 16-26).

Wherein Gleason said message is a multimedia message (e.g. a MM can contain all kind of messages, like sounds, speech, etc.) (col. 10, lines 28-30; col. 12, lines 4-7; col. 37, lines 54-57).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Mukherjee to include said message is a multimedia message as taught by Gleason. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been lead to make such a modification in order to deliver a variety of messages including pictures, video clips, sounds, speech, etc.

12. Claim 38 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mukherjee, as applied to claim 35, in further view of Gleason.

Regarding claim 38, the terminal device of claim 35, wherein Mukherjee does not disclose said message is a multimedia message.

Gleason discloses a terminal device (Fig. 1, 10) for receiving a message for which a condition for receiving said message is set for use (col. 10, lines 46-55; col. 12, lines 2-7; col. 24, line 66 – col. 25, line 2) in network (Fig. 1), comprising:

a receiving means configured to receive said message (col. 10, line 46 – col. 11, line 10);
a judging means configured to determine whether a delivery report is to be transmitted in
response to receiving said message;
and
a transmitting means configured to transmit said delivery report when said judging means
determines that said delivery report is to be transmitted (col. 12, lines 46-57; col. 20, lines 44-53;
col. 25, lines 16-26).

Wherein Gleason said message is a multimedia message (e.g. a MM can contain all kind
of messages, like sounds, speech, etc.) (col. 10, lines 28-30; col. 12, lines 4-7; col. 37, lines 54-
57).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention
was made to modify the terminal device of Mukherjee to include said message is a multimedia
message as taught by Gleason. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been lead to make
such a modification in order to deliver a variety of messages including pictures, video clips,
sounds, speech, etc.

Conclusion

13. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time
policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE
MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO
MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after
the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See PTO-892 Form.

15. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or faxed to:

(571) 273-8300 (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or call:

(571) 272-2600 (for customer service assistance)

16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lisa Hashem whose telephone number is (571) 272-7542. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang can be reached on (571) 272-7547. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600.

17. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

lh
May 10, 2007



FAN TSANG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600